REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the amended claims and the arguments set forth fully below. In the Final Office Action mailed May 3, 2006, Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 22-31 have been rejected. In response, the applicants have amended claims 1-3, 5, 7, 22 and 28, and have submitted the following Remarks. Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 22-31 are still pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11, and 22-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,363,393 to Ribitzky (hereafter Ribitzky) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,675 to Evans et al.(hereafter Evans). The applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

Ribitzky teaches a component-based object relational database infrastructure and user interface, where a system for accessing business data stored in one or more databases by a user is implemented (Ribitzky, abstract). Within the Office Action, it is stated in columns 9 and 10 of Ribitzky, that a first component and a second component having a functional code segment as well as a first user interface code segment is taught. It is also stated within the Office Action that a container application having a first user interface layer in communication with the first component and a second user interface layer in communication with the second component is taught.

However, Ribitzky does not teach a PACS and a RIS each having a functionality code segment and a first use interface segment. Furthermore, as is recognized by the Office Action, Ribitzky does not explicitly disclose the uniform user interface such that the patient date of the functionality code segments of the first and second computer components are formatted with the same look and feel.

Evans teaches a system and method for using a relational database to enable the dynamic configuration of an application program. As is taught in several passages of Evans, this invention teaches utilizing a relational database to uniformly configure data from a single application program, not from multiple components. While Evans utilizes such a relational database to provide a uniform display for user, Evans does not teach a PACS and a RIS each having a functionality code segment and a first use interface segment.

The present invention teaches a PACS and a RIS, both having a functionality code segment as well as a user interface code segment. The present invention also includes a container application, wherein the container application has user interface layers corresponding to each of the user interface code segments of the PACS and the RIS components. The container application also includes a uniform user interface utilized to communicate patient data between the functionality codes segments of the PACS and RIS, and the uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments of the PACS and RIS are formatted with the same look and feel. As stated above, neither Ribitzky, Evans, nor their combination teach a PACS and RIS, each having functionality code segments as well as user interface code segments, nor do they teach a uniform user interface to communicate patient data between the functionality code segments of the components and the uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments of the first and second components are formatted with the same look and feel.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a data management system for patient data, comprising a PACS having a functionally code segment and a first user interface code segment, a RIS having a functionality code segment and a second user interface code segment, and a container application having a first user interface layer in communication with the PACS and a second user interface layer in communication with the RIS, wherein the first and second user interface layers are configured to convert the first user interface code segment of the PACS and the second user interface code segment of the RIS to a

uniform user interface and to communicate patient data between the functionality code segments of the PACS and RIS, respectively, and the uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments of the PACS and RIS are formatted with the same look and feel.

As described above, neither Ribitzky, Evans, nor their combination teach or make obvious a PACS and RIS, each having a functionality code segment and a user interface code segment, nor a uniform user interface to communicate patient data between the functionality code segments of the components and the uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments of the PACS and RIS are formatted with the same look and feel.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 28-31 are dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 2-3, 5-6 and 20-31 are also allowable being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 7 is directed to a data management system for patient data. For the same reasons described above for Claim 1, the independent Claim 7 is also allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, and their combination.

Claims 8 and 10-11 depend upon the independent Claim 7. As described above, the independent Claim 7 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 10-11 are also allowable as being dependent upon allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 22 is directed to a method of displaying patient data from a plurality of applications. For the reasons described above in Claims 1 and 7, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans and their combination.

Claims 23-27 depend upon the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans and their

combination. Accordingly, Claims 23-27 are also allowable being dependent upon allowable base claim.

For these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (414)271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By _Christopher M. Scherer_
Christopher M. Scherer
Reg. No. 50,655

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Attorney Docket No.: 15-IS-5288 (5024-00039)